THE COURT: All right. What are we doing here today?

What are the issues? Let's start with plaintiff's counsel,

Mr. Michelen.

MR. MICHELEN: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor.

Judge, we're here basically because we filed a motion for an extension of discovery relating to some documentary discovery that has not been turned over by the defendants, and part of the issue is that, as you know, the whole case involves the defendant's website and catalog.

We completed the depositions of all the named defendants in the action -- Shane Gebauer, Stephen and Sandra Forrest. Mr. Gebauer, who is now the CEO and, at the time of the filing of the complaint and at some of the relevant time in the complaint, was general manager of the company, stated he really had no knowledge as to who provided the content for the website, how the website was developed, didn't remember who did it, didn't remember what third-party vendor did it, etc.

When we deposed the Forrests, they both said that was entirely in the control of Mr. Gebauer. So in our initial discovery demand we requested emails between the parties to show the discussion Mr. Ficsher had with respect to how his product may be described in the Brushy Mountain catalog, their response, etc., as well as drafts, revisions, and amendments of the catalog from 2008 to present. We got a general objection that the demand was overbroad, etc.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Hand up the request. Or if the response includes the request, then I only need that.

MR. MICHELEN: Yes, it does, Judge. If you want to see the individual demands, they're here.

THE COURT: So which one are we fighting about?

MR. MICHELEN: Right off the bat, with number one, all emails, correspondences, letters, etc. And, number two, all draft provisions, amendments, and final versions.

THE COURT: Let me stop you right here.

Mr. Hudson, you may have just given me the case I've been waiting for to write an opinion waking the bar up to the fact that Rule 34 was amended now a year and two or three months ago.

Have you explained your responses in light of the amendment to Rule 34 of the federal rules?

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor. I don't believe -- it certainly wasn't my intention. Your Honor, with respect to number one, we stand by --

THE COURT: Answer my question first. If you don't know what I'm talking about, you can say that.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I'll have to look at Rule 34.

THE COURT: Did you look at it before you signed the discovery responses?

MR. HUDSON: I believe I did look at the amendment beforehand, your Honor. These were initially sent November 17 1 of 2016.

2.3

MR. MICHELEN: Judge, that's the amended response I sent you, which was in February of this year.

THE COURT: I understand. Any time once we were passed December 1, 2015, the new rules apply. So let's sort of cut to the chase.

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is a strong likelihood, depending on what my schedule is over the next week or two, that you are going to get a published opinion that you're not going to like because it is going to name you and serve as a wake-up call to other lawyers to not make the same mistake you're making, which, unfortunately, you're not alone in, and I've sort of been waiting for the right case to come along and write an opinion on.

Let's, however, get to the merits. How much email or other correspondence is there between the Brushy Mountain folks and Mr. Fischer?

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, the answer is I'm not 100 percent sure. The reason being is that during this time period, a lot of time each individual person had their own computer.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt. It's unduly burdensome is one of the objections, and you've now just told me you don't have a clue what's there.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, this is a very, very broad request. Mr. Ficsher --

2.3

THE COURT: How many emails are we talking about?

MR. HUDSON: The emails that I saw, your Honor, just relating to Bee-Quick from Mr. Shane Gebauer, we're dealing with about 34.

THE COURT: Oh, my God. Thirty-four emails. Note my sarcasm, Mr. Hudson. We're going to make this simple. The objections being in violation of Rule 34 with respect to request number 1, and, therefore --

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, can I at least explain why we think they're overly broad? It's not really within the scope of just Bee-Quick. Mr. Ficsher purchased a bunch of products from --

THE COURT: Counsel, I understand that. If you had done this right, perhaps you would prevail and this would be limited to Bee-Quick. But when you don't follow the rules and when you're telling me that Mr. Gebauer's emails totaled all of 34, I'm not really interested in wasting my time if you can't follow rules.

The objections to number 1 are denied as frivolous and violative of the rules, and therefore, you need to answer request for production number one.

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: Now, I am likely to similarly rule with a lot of the rest of these. So I'll give you a choice. We can continue down the road with me getting more and more annoyed and, therefore, more and more of your objections being tossed in their entirety, even if the request is overbroad, or — today is Thursday — by Monday you can serve amended responses and agree with plaintiff's counsel on how soon you are going to produce documents.

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor. I'll do that. Can we at least talk about a couple of them, your Honor, especially number 2. We talked about that during our hearing in January. Defendants have provided the catalogs. We don't have any revisions or amendments, but I'll make that clear in our response to answer number 2.

THE COURT: With all due respect, your actual response says you haven't produced a catalog. You produced a cover page and the page for Bee-Quick or Natural Honey.

Are you now saying you're willing to produce the entire catalog? Or do you want to go with the issue of whether your response complies with the rules or not?

MR. HUDSON: Well, your Honor, when we were at the hearing -- I think Mr. Michelen will agree -- we objected because we hadn't produced the whole catalog, and we were ordered to produce only the cover page and the page that had

1 | the Bee-Quick or the Natural Honey Harvester on it.

2.3

THE COURT: You're one of 100 cases or whatever. I don't remember absolutely everything. If that's what I previously ruled, then I don't know why we're talking about this request at all.

MR. MICHELEN: I'll tell you why, Judge. Because since that time of the hearing, the Forrests have now testified that they are the actual authors of the kind of witty remarks that are the subject of this action. So some of the way the rest of the products are described are now more relevant than they were before.

We originally understood the primary defense to be lack of originality and that it was not copyrightable and not protectable. They now actually say that it was of actual origin of theirs.

Our position, based upon that, is that that's the only ad, if you will, that is of any wit or any similar content, and we wanted to get some of the other ads to show that they're provided either by the vendor or simply a simple description to get a bigger picture of defendant's catalog overall.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, is there any reason, based on that, that you shouldn't produce the entire catalogs?

MR. HUDSON: I think that our client came up with this well before 2008. This was only limited to 2008.

THE COURT: You may have just opened yourself up to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. HUDSON: I'll try to work it out. If we would have had a meet-and-confer to start with under the rules, I think that a lot of these issues could have been resolved.

THE COURT: I suspect that's so. Then the question is: Mr. Michelen, why wasn't there a meet-and-confer?

MR. MICHELEN: Judge, it was after the deposition that this other issue had come up, and we have had these discussions with Mr. Hudson before with respect to the documents.

What brought this even to a quicker head was their amended Rule 26 served in February, which said they're going to

use the exact documents that we demanded they had refused to produce.

THE COURT: Hand up the Rule 26.

MR. MICHELEN: Let me just give you the date for the record, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MICHELEN: February 10. If you look at page 4, which I have the page turned to, that's what set this in motion. Frankly, with the deadline approaching, we asked for the extension of discovery to address it.

THE COURT: The description of the documents you're going to use based on this, which are broad enough to drive a truck through, certainly cover what the plaintiff is requesting, which makes me even less happy.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I think that this Rule 26 on page 4 aiai are documents that are in our possession, custody, or control that would support plaintiff's contentions, not what we're going to produce at trial.

THE COURT: With all due respect, I think you need to reread Rule 26(a), and to take the example of the simple traffic accident and witnesses -- Rule 26(a) says it's the stuff that's good for you that you will or may use because if you don't list it, you can't use it.

In a traffic accident, if there are two witnesses, one of whom says, the plaintiff ran the red light, which isn't very

good for the plaintiff, and the other one says, the plaintiff
was sideswiped by the defendant who was going 90 miles an hour
on a city street, the plaintiff only has to list on their 26(a)

that second witness.

2.3

Here you list the let's preserve all options, email communications with plaintiff. You don't say email communications about Bee-Quick. You don't say email communications dated X, Y, Z dates but not others.

You've opened the door, to put it mildly, but you're all wasting my time. You're going to have another, if there was one -- and if there wasn't one -- by telephone or in person, probably with the location that exists here, it's going to be by telephone, but not the nasty gram emails going back and forth, I want this. I'm not giving it to you, blah, blah, blah.

There will be a revision on Monday, and we'll have a conference on Tuesday, if that's what you think is necessary. That's the only day next week after Monday that I'm available. I'll squeeze you in. If you want, I'll bring you in the week of March 6 and give you a little more time to work it out, but by that point, I would expect you to have produced all the documents.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I will email Mr. Michelen and ask him to set up a conference, and I am 100 percent confident that we can get this issue resolved and we can work this out.

THE COURT: Because you're out of time or almost out of time on the discovery period, and I know that's probably the last thing we'll take up. Whatever you haven't produced that you're going to have to produce, don't say to him, oh, I need 30 days to do it, let alone a longer time period, because even if Mr. Michelen were to agree to that, I'm not.

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I will expect to receive a letter from all of you by close of business Monday, whether you have resolved these issues or not. And then depending on whether you have or haven't will depend on whether -- most likely to make it really work, I'll be setting a date for the week of March 6. So prepare for that.

What else do we need to do today from the plaintiff's side? Holding off on the when we're going to extend the discovery cutoff.

MR. MICHELEN: I believe that's it, as long as we wait for the responses. I guess we'll follow up, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, any other issues from the defense?

MR. HUDSON: The only thing we have outstanding -- and Mr. Michelen and I can talk about it tomorrow -- is that we're still owed some discovery from the plaintiff back from a discovery conference we had in front of Judge Pitman back in May.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I suggest you all work it out. If you waited from May to now to bring it to the Court's attention, I'll leave three dots after that sentence. Work it out, guys.

MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The same Monday ruling, meaning by Monday you're going to resolve things, or you're going to write a letter telling me what's not resolved and attach whatever documents I may need to resolve it, and we'll go from there.

So the cutoff, unless my notes are in worse shape than I thought, passed a week ago.

MR. MICHELEN: It was the day before I wrote the So 2-16, your Honor, is my recollection.

THE COURT: It was the 15th. I won't quibble over the day. First of all, I know the objections to the R&R are still pending. I've got no control over the timing on that.

Is there going to be a summary judgment motion, or are we able to go straight to trial?

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, we filed a letter brief in accordance with the scheduling order on Friday indicating the defendants are going to file a summary judgment motion. We did ask too that some of the issues on the summary judgment motion are pending at the R&R -- if we could either wait until after the R&R is ruled upon or at least have an extension from where it is now, which is next Friday.

THE COURT: Somehow I didn't see a copy of that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So you don't need further clearance.

So, as of now, the summary judgment motion is due April 3. I might kick it to the end of April. After that at some point, all bets are going to be off, and we're just going and what can I do to help you settle the case, because I cannot imagine that the amount of damages Mr. Ficsher could win, even if he prevails, are not going to be miniscule compared to attorneys' fees that may or may not be awarded.

So, madam reporter, we're off.

(Recess)

THE COURT: The parties should continue to talk amongst themselves with respect to settlement and, more importantly, should figure out what their availability is and contact my secretary to see what works with my availability and try to get it done sooner rather than later.

I'm not going to ask Judge Engelmayer not to rule because that will just delay the case indefinitely. If you don't get in before he rules, you'll have the advantage or disadvantage of having that.

I am going to assume that the letter I get from all of you on Monday is going to say you have cured all your problems and will tell me when you're each producing the missing material to your adversary. You do not give each other too much extra time.

If there are disputes left over from that, we will have a conference probably the week of March 6. I'm going to set the date. Depending how complicated your remaining problems are, for that, Mr. Hudson, you may have to be here in person.

1 MR. HUDSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Another incentive for you all to work things out.

The usual drill. The transcript is the Court's order. As I say, depending on my schedule and how much time I want to spend not for review but for the educational bar at large, there may be a decision criticizing the noncompliance with amended Rule 34. If there is, there is. If there isn't, there isn't. So be it.

Work very, very hard to resolve this case.

Normally in settlement conferences, in addition to clients

being here, I require the parties to send an ex parte, meaning

not to your adversary, settlement memo explaining why you think

the case should settle in the way you think it should settle

and including whatever you all had in discussion on the bid and

ask going forward.

Think about in this case whether it makes sense to do that in two pieces: One that talks about the DMCA and other issues we were talking about off the record and exchange that with each other so you'll each be better prepared and then a copy to me of course. Then a separate ex parte that says, we are willing to settle for three times the gross national product. They offered us a \$10 MetroCard. Now our real approximate range is X. Just think about that.

MR. MICHELEN: I think that would be very beneficial.

THE COURT: The only question is I don't want -- and I think we can say that it's under Rule 408, only for settlement purposes, so you can do a little less pounding on the table and a little more candor about, well, this case supports us, but this other case can be read the other way, and we'll be candid with our adversary and the Court with respect to that, not that you shouldn't in a formal motion, but we're doing it for settlement purposes.

So that's what I'll expect, unless you all do something different, even though the order you will eventually get will probably be the in-the-can order that says it's all exparte.

THE COURT: Any follow-up questions from that? Or are we done?

MR. MICHELEN: For the plaintiff, Judge, we're done. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I do have one question as related to the settlement conference. This is a question that came from my client. If they had an independent adjustor with settlement authority there, is that acceptable? Or does your Honor want someone from the National, which is the insurance company, to be at the settlement conference?

THE COURT: Whoever has authority to write a check for the amount that plaintiff is asking for.

MR. HUDSON: Okay.

THE COURT: What I mean by that is I don't care whether it is the person from National or the adjustor that National has hired independently, but if that person is coming, it's not going to be, you know, Judge, I'm tapped out at three MetroCards because that's all the folks at headquarters who I report to gave me, but I appear. I have the pocketbook. I have full authority. If convinced that the plaintiff is right, I can authorize the writing of the check for the amount that the plaintiff is asking for. Got it?

MR. HUDSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But I want somebody from your client in-house as well. It doesn't have to be all three of them, whether it's Mr. Gebauer or one of the Fischers or even somebody else, somebody who can represent the client in case — by the way, think about whether, in addition to this money changing hands, I know there is now probably bad blood among the clients, but you used to do business together.

If the defendant is writing a check for X, then the plaintiff is getting a check for X. It's equally painful and beneficial to the two. If there is a business deal that can be part of the settlement, we will sell your product, whatever, each side might actually be getting some additional benefit from that.

Think about that as well. It may be that all that